

*Please provide the following information, and submit to the NOAA DM Plan Repository.*

**Reference to Master DM Plan (if applicable)**

*As stated in Section IV, Requirement 1.3, DM Plans may be hierarchical. If this DM Plan inherits provisions from a higher-level DM Plan already submitted to the Repository, then this more-specific Plan only needs to provide information that differs from what was provided in the Master DM Plan.*

URL of higher-level DM Plan (if any) as submitted to DM Plan Repository:

**1. General Description of Data to be Managed****1.1. Name of the Data, data collection Project, or data-producing Program:**

2017 NOAA NGS Topobathy Lidar DEM: St. Jeromes Creek, MD

**1.2. Summary description of the data:**

This data was collected by NOAA using a Riegl VQ880G sensor. The data was acquired August 5, 2017. The data includes topobathy data in LAS 1.2 format classified as created, unclassified (1); ground (2); topographic noise (7); bathymetric noise (22); water column (25); bathymetric bottom (26); water surface (27); International Hydrographic Organization S-57 object; not otherwise specified (30), in accordance with project specifications. The project consists of approximately 34 square miles of data along the shores of St. Jeromes Creek. This dataset contains 342 500 m x 500 m lidar tiles.

**1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?**

One-time data collection

**1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:**

2017-08-05

**1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:**

W: -76.386945, E: -76.304493, N: 38.165636, S: 38.020557

**1.6. Type(s) of data:**

*(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)*  
Elevation Data

**1.7. Data collection method(s):**

*(e.g., satellite, airplane, unmanned aerial system, radar, weather station, moored buoy, research vessel, autonomous underwater vehicle, animal tagging, manual surveys, enforcement activities, numerical model, etc.)*

**1.8. If data are from a NOAA Observing System of Record, indicate name of system:****1.8.1. If data are from another observing system, please specify:**

**2. Point of Contact for this Data Management Plan (author or maintainer)****2.1. Name:**

Office for Coastal Management (OCM)

**2.2. Title:**

Metadata Contact

**2.3. Affiliation or facility:**

Office for Coastal Management (OCM)

**2.4. E-mail address:****2.5. Phone number:****3. Responsible Party for Data Management**

*Program Managers, or their designee, shall be responsible for assuring the proper management of the data produced by their Program. Please indicate the responsible party below.*

**3.1. Name:****3.2. Title:**

Data Steward

**4. Resources**

*Programs must identify resources within their own budget for managing the data they produce.*

**4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?****4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management (specify percentage or "unknown"):****5. Data Lineage and Quality**

*NOAA has issued Information Quality Guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information which it disseminates.*

**5.1. Processing workflow of the data from collection or acquisition to making it publicly accessible**

*(describe or provide URL of description):*

Lineage Statement:

Lidar was acquired by NOAA and processed by Dewberry.

Process Steps:

- 2019-02-01 00:00:00 - Data for the St. Jeromes Creek project was acquired by NOAA using a Riegl VQ880G sensor. All delivered lidar data is referenced to: Horizontal Datum-NAD83 (2011) epoch: 2010 Projection-UTM Zone 18 North Horizontal Units-meters Vertical Datum-NAD83(2011) epoch: 2010 Vertical Units-meters This dataset encompasses 342 500m x 500m tiles. Both green lidar data and NIR lidar data were acquired. NOAA acquired, calibrated, and performed the refraction correction of the lidar data. Light travels at different speeds in air versus water and its direction of travel or angle is changed or refracted when entering the water column. The refraction correction process corrects for this difference by adjusting the depth (distance traveled) and horizontal position (change of angle/direction) of the lidar data acquired within water. Dewberry received the calibrated green and NIR data and verified complete coverage. Relative accuracy of the green swaths compared to overlapping and adjacent green swaths as well as the relative accuracy of green swaths compared to overlapping and adjacent NIR swaths was verified through the use of Delta-Z (DZ) orthos created in GeoCue software. Intr swath or within a swath relative accuracy was verified using Quick Terrain Modeler. Profiles of elevated planar features, such as roofs, were used to verify horizontal alignment between overlapping swaths. Dewberry used algorithms in TerraScan to create the initial ground/submerged topography surface. Dewberry created 2-D breaklines by digitizing breaklines in a 2-D environment using intensity imagery as a reference. Dewberry used the 2-D breaklines to classify the bathymetric bottom and ground points properly in TerraScan. All lidar data was peer-reviewed. Dewberry's QA/QC also included creating void polygons for use during review. All necessary edits were applied to the dataset. GeoCue software was used to update LAS header information, including all projection and coordinate reference system information. The final lidar data is in LAS format 1.2 and point data record format 3. The final classification scheme is as follows: 1-Unclassified 2-Ground 7-Topographic Noise 22-Bathymetric Noise 25-Water Column 26-Bathymetric Bottom 27-Water Surface 30-International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) S-57 Object All data was then verified by an Independent QC department within Dewberry. The independent QC was performed by separate analysts who did not perform manual classification or editing. The independent QC involved quantitative and qualitative reviews.

- 2019-03-01 00:00:00 - Dewberry made a copy of the final lidar data and transformed the data from ellipsoid heights to orthometric heights, referenced to NAVD88 Geoid 12B, meters. The lidar data in orthometric heights was used to create the final topobathymetric DEMs in orthometric heights Lidar data was converted to a LAS Dataset. Lidar data classified as ground (2) and submerged topography (26) were then used to generate a raster in IMG format with 1 meter pixel resolution. The output raster was created over the full AOI area to reduce edge-matching issues and improve seamlessness. The raster was clipped to the tile grid and named according to project specifications to result in tiled topobathymetric DEMs. All tiled DEMs incorporate the use of the void polygons. The void polygons represent bathymetric areas with no bathymetric bottom returns

and are set as NoData in the DEMs. Void polygon creation is described in the final project report and the void polygon metadata. A confidence layer has been created and provided to NOAA as part of the deliverables. Except where there are not enough lidar data points in a pixel to calculate a standard deviation value, the confidence layer is a raster product in IMG format with 1 meter square pixels. The confidence layer provides a standard deviation value for every pixel by calculating the standard deviation of all ground and/or submerged topography lidar points that are located within a single pixel. The confidence layer pixels align to the pixels in the topobathy DEMs. The confidence layer can be displayed by unique values or classified into desired bins/ranges for analysis over larger areas.

**5.1.1. If data at different stages of the workflow, or products derived from these data, are subject to a separate data management plan, provide reference to other plan:**

**5.2. Quality control procedures employed (describe or provide URL of description):**

## **6. Data Documentation**

*The EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive requires that NOAA data be well documented, specifies the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for documentation of new data, and provides links to resources and tools for metadata creation and validation.*

**6.1. Does metadata comply with EDMC Data Documentation directive?**

No

**6.1.1. If metadata are non-existent or non-compliant, please explain:**

Missing/invalid information:

- 1.7. Data collection method(s)
- 2.4. Point of Contact Email
- 3.1. Responsible Party for Data Management
- 4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?
- 4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management
- 5.2. Quality control procedures employed
- 7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?
- 7.1.1. If data are not available or has limitations, has a Waiver been filed?
- 7.1.2. If there are limitations to data access, describe how data are protected
- 7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination
- 8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location
- 8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility
- 8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?

**6.2. Name of organization or facility providing metadata hosting:**

NMFS Office of Science and Technology

**6.2.1. If service is needed for metadata hosting, please indicate:****6.3. URL of metadata folder or data catalog, if known:**

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/56773>

**6.4. Process for producing and maintaining metadata**

*(describe or provide URL of description):*

Metadata produced and maintained in accordance with the NOAA Data Documentation Procedural Directive: [https://nosc.noaa.gov/EDMC/DAARWG/docs/EDMC\\_PD-Data\\_Documentation\\_v1.pdf](https://nosc.noaa.gov/EDMC/DAARWG/docs/EDMC_PD-Data_Documentation_v1.pdf)

**7. Data Access**

*NAO 212-15 states that access to environmental data may only be restricted when distribution is explicitly limited by law, regulation, policy (such as those applicable to personally identifiable information or protected critical infrastructure information or proprietary trade information) or by security requirements. The EDMC Data Access Procedural Directive contains specific guidance, recommends the use of open-standard, interoperable, non-proprietary web services, provides information about resources and tools to enable data access, and includes a Waiver to be submitted to justify any approach other than full, unrestricted public access.*

**7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?**

**7.1.1. If the data are not to be made available to the public at all, or with limitations, has a Waiver (Appendix A of Data Access directive) been filed?**

**7.1.2. If there are limitations to public data access, describe how data are protected from unauthorized access or disclosure:**

**7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:**

Office for Coastal Management (OCM)

**7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:****7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:**

<https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/lidar/search/where:ID=8778>

[https://coast.noaa.gov/htdata/raster2/elevation/NGS\\_MD\\_StJeromesCreek\\_DEM\\_2017\\_8778](https://coast.noaa.gov/htdata/raster2/elevation/NGS_MD_StJeromesCreek_DEM_2017_8778)

**7.3. Data access methods or services offered:**

Data is available online for custom downloads

**7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:**

**7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:**

## **8. Data Preservation and Protection**

*The NOAA Procedure for Scientific Records Appraisal and Archive Approval describes how to identify, appraise and decide what scientific records are to be preserved in a NOAA archive.*

### **8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location:**

*(Specify NCEI-MD, NCEI-CO, NCEI-NC, NCEI-MS, World Data Center (WDC) facility, Other, To Be Determined, Unable to Archive, or No Archiving Intended)*

**8.1.1. If World Data Center or Other, specify:**

**8.1.2. If To Be Determined, Unable to Archive or No Archiving Intended, explain:**

### **8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility (if any):**

Office for Coastal Management - Charleston, SC

### **8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility:**

### **8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?**

*Discuss data back-up, disaster recovery/contingency planning, and off-site data storage relevant to the data collection*

## **9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions**

*Line and Staff Offices may extend this template by inserting additional questions in this section.*